

# Real Time Optimization for Quality Control of Batch Thermal Sterilization of Prepackaged Foods

Antonio A. Alonso, Ana Arias-Méndez, Eva Balsa-Canto, Míriam R. García, Juan I. Molina, Carlos Vilas, Marcos Villafán

---

## Abstract

In this contribution, we present a distributed decision-making architecture for control to optimally command thermal sterilization, despite process uncertainty or unexpected process disturbances. The control structure combines in a synchronous way modeling and simulation environments with efficient system identification and dynamic optimization tools and methods. Process simulation provides a complete dynamic description of the current status of the operation, including the evolution of temperature and pressure in the retort unit as well as temporal and spatial distribution of temperature and quality or safety parameters within the product. Such virtual representation will be regularly confronted with plant measurements to quantify the degree of discrepancy (uncertainty) between real plant and models and react accordingly when such discrepancy becomes unacceptable by re-estimating plant parameters, either during the cycle or from batch to batch. The virtual plant will be also accessed by the regulatory system as well as the dynamic optimization module. In the first instance to estimate unmeasured states related with the product status (e.g. temperature in the product or lethality) under feed-back control. In the second, to continuously recompute optimal cycle profiles so to respond to unexpected disturbances or deviations from the prescribed safety constraints while maximizing quality attributes. Experimental evidence of the complete control system performance will be given on the operation of a pilot plant prototype.

*Keywords:* Thermal Sterilization, Real Time Optimization, On-line Control, Parameter Identification, Optimal Quality Control, Food Safety Control

---

## 1. Introduction

The primary goal of thermal sterilization is the destruction or inactivation by the action of heat of potentially harmful spores or microorganisms that might be present in the foodstuff. To that purpose the prepackaged product is subject to a prescribed temperature-time profile calculated so to ensure the reduction of spores or microorganisms to levels that are harmless for human consumption, even if stored during large periods of time.

Thermal sterilization is a particularly demanding operation both in terms of energy consumption and process time. In addition, it may lead to significant product quality losses if not operated properly, as nutrients or sensory parameters (color or texture for instance) can be adversely affected by the thermal treatment. In fact, and apart from those situations which might demand some desired “cooking effect” that requires heating beyond that needed for food safety (Teixeira & Tucker, 1997), thermal processes will have a detrimental influence on product quality (real or perceived).

The effect of the time-temperature profiles on the operation costs and product quality, was quite well understood in the past. In the same way, the adverse effect of disturbances in the process, such as those in steam supply that could lead to rejection of the batch or reprocessing were studied also extensively (Teixeira & Tucker, 1997).

As early as in the 70’s, research efforts in thermal sterilization were directed to compute optimal retort temperature profiles. The formulation of optimal control problems for thermal processing typically made use of retort temperature as the control variable (Teixeira et al., 1975). Saguy & Karel (1979) and Nadkarni & Hatton (1985) were among the first to formulate and solve an optimal control problem to maximize quality (in this case thiamine retention) in thermal processing for conduction-heated foodstuff. The resulting optimal profiles usually consisted of retort temperatures hitting upper and lower constraints (bang-bang control). The study of optimal control policies for thermal sterilization was extended by Banga et al. (1991) to a number of optimal control problems involving minimization of time and energy, in addition to maximizing product quality, subject to a constraint on the minimum final lethality. As a result, a set of constant and variable retort temperature profiles were proposed. Its implementation however required knowledge of the retort dynamics which in turn demanded advanced controllers (Alonso et al., 1997, 1998). A review on optimization methods to compute optimal temperature profiles can be found in Durance (1997).

38 Based on a model predictive control paradigm, Chalabi et al. (1999) pro-  
39 posed the on-line implementation of an optimal control solution for thermal  
40 sterilization. However, the controller only made use of the heat transfer  
41 model for the product without consideration of the dynamics of the retort.

42 Similar problems were considered by Balsa-Canto et al. (2002b) to explore  
43 the potentialities in dynamic optimization of reduced order models based on  
44 POD (Proper Orthogonal Decomposition) expansions of the product heat  
45 transfer equation. More recently, optimal control problems for thermal ster-  
46 ilization oriented to quality maximization have been undertaken in the con-  
47 text of multi-objective optimization (Erdogdu & Balaban, 2003; Sendin et al.,  
48 2010; Abakarov et al., 2009), local and global optimization algorithms (Chen  
49 & Ramaswamy, 2002; Ansorena & Salvadori, 2011; Miri et al., 2008; Enitan &  
50 Adeyemo, 2011), and adaptive search techniques (Miri et al., 2008; Simpson  
51 et al., 2008; Simpson & Abakarov, 2011).

52 Unfortunately, in computing optimal policies for thermal processing most  
53 works disregard the dynamics of the retort, including the regulatory layer.  
54 This in many instances may lead to unfeasible retort temperature profiles  
55 or processes undergoing high energy consumptions, as observed by Alonso  
56 et al. (1997, 1998) and confirmed in the present contribution. These authors  
57 developed model based and adaptive control schemes to implement optimal  
58 retort temperature profiles that minimized the adverse effects produced by  
59 temperature deviations.

60 Typically, what is meant by on-line retort control is the implementation  
61 of logic decision charts which in the event of given deviations in temperature  
62 or pressure will propose alternative heating profiles (usually constant time-  
63 temperature) compliant with a process requirement. This usually reduces to  
64 a minimum required lethality and does not pay attention to product quality.  
65 As discussed in Teixeira & Tucker (1997); Akterian (1999), and more recently  
66 by Simpson et al. (2007a,b); Chen et al. (2008), system decisions are based  
67 on real-time recording of microbiological lethality. Monitoring can be done  
68 either from direct temperature measurements at the center of the can or  
69 predicted by mathematical models that describe the temperature distribution  
70 within the can (and thus lethality at the cold point) based on the actual retort  
71 temperature. Monitoring systems may be completed with a set of decision  
72 rules aimed at selecting a given constant retort temperature to track, in the  
73 event of process deviations, so to assure a minimum lethality. More advanced  
74 rules are computed by taking into account previous temperature history but  
75 usually assume constant temperature until the end of the cycle (Simpson

76 et al., 2007b). Nonetheless, to the best of our knowledge, no provisions for  
77 process re-optimization have been incorporated in these implementations yet.

78 Nowadays and mainly driven by consumer demand, food industries are  
79 making significant efforts to ensure that their products will attain the highest  
80 possible quality without compromising safety standards (this meaning real  
81 or perceived quality). This in turn has a direct impact on the price the  
82 consumer is willing to pay for the products and therefore on the company  
83 turnover, which in addition will influence the company's strategic position in  
84 the market (Miri et al., 2008).

85 Good examples include the so-called *gourmet* preparations or products  
86 packaged in new formats as it is the case of flexible packs (Simpson et al.,  
87 2004). While over-processing will result in unacceptable quality losses, safety  
88 constraint satisfaction near its very lower limit becomes more and more crit-  
89 ical (Martins et al., 2008). In a related way, processing flexible packages or  
90 retortable pouches demands strict pressure control during the whole cycle in  
91 order to avoid sharp pressure drops which might damage containers, thereby  
92 favoring product recontamination (Alonso et al., 1997).

93 All this calls for novel operation modes for thermal sterilization, optimally  
94 adapted to product safety and quality specifications even in the presence of  
95 faults (e.g. temporary down-fall of the steam supply). Such aim, however, is  
96 hampered by a number of obstacles which difficult on-line optimal decision  
97 making. Among those, one must point out the complexity of any reliable  
98 description of a process (a model) which being essentially batch, may in-  
99 volve a variety of phenomena associated to bio-transformations as well as  
100 mass and energy transfer mechanisms with its diversity of spatial and tem-  
101 poral scales (Koribilli et al., 2011). From a control point of view, advanced  
102 model-based predictive control methods (MPC) are the appropriate frame-  
103 work capable of producing optimal temperature and pressure profiles on an  
104 uncertain environment (Camacho & Bordóns, 1995; Banga et al., 2008). In  
105 particular, the MPC approach has been successfully applied in the context  
106 of batch processes in the food industry, (e.g. Flores-Cerrillo & MacGregor,  
107 2005; Kurtanjek, 2008).

108  
109 Pursuing such direction, this contribution presents a robust model based  
110 decision-making architecture to optimally command thermal processing oper-  
111 ation, despite process uncertainty or unexpected process disturbances. Some  
112 novel features of the present control system must be underlined as they sur-  
113 mount the main obstacles to real time implementation. These include, the




Figure 1: A detail of the pilot plant batch steam retort employed for the control experiments. It can be distinguished in the picture a pneumatic valve at the upper left corner and two of the three PT100 located around the vessel.

availability of efficient (i.e. fast) yet accurate simulations of the process, and the possible infeasibility of the resulting policies. The first issue has been overcome by taking advantage of highly efficient model reduction techniques for partial differential equations (which in our case would be associated to the heat transfer model within the product) based on spectral methods, and particularly on the POD method (see for example, Sirovich, 1987; Balsa-Canto et al., 2002a). On the other hand, infeasibility of the resulting optimal retort temperature profile has been overcome by including within the dynamic optimization problem the dynamics of the thermal unit itself. Such extensions to previous work will be described in detail in the paper. Finally, experimental evidence of the performance exhibited by the proposed control configuration will be given and discussed, constituting the main contribution of the work.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Thermal plant description

This study considers the problem of optimally controlling the pilot plant steam batch thermal sterilization unit depicted in Figure 1. A typical sterilization cycle is usually divided in three stages known as venting, heating and cooling (Lopez, 1987). During the first stage (venting) air is swept off the retort with steam to ensure that the heating medium contains just saturated steam. To that purpose, bleeder and drain valves are kept fully open while steam is being injected in the retort until its pressure equals that




Figure 2: A diagram of the thermal processing unit and the computer acquisition and control system. The thermal system includes the steam supply line and the sterilization retort. ADAM modules (Advantech) are employed to record temperature and pressure in the vessel and send it to the computer. Valve positions are transmitted to the actuation elements by the computer via a digital card (National Instruments).

135 of water vapor pressure at the retort temperature. The cycle continues with  
 136 the heating stage, which is where sterilization mainly takes place, by keeping  
 137 the product under a given (constant or variable) retort temperature profile  
 138 associated to a prescribed lethality at the coldest point within the product.  
 139 Finally, and in order to reduce over-processing, the product is cooled down  
 140 to room temperature by water flowing into the process vessel. Typically,  
 141 the food product will be cooled with water either by immersion or a shower  
 142 over the retort load. In order to compensate for any pressure drop that  
 143 results from vapor condensation, overpressure is produced in the retort by  
 144 air injection, right before water enters.

145 The sterilization unit used in this work consists of a 350 liters steel vessel  
 146 with a product storage grid box with rotary capacity and a fan to ensure  
 147 temperature homogeneity during the heating sterilization cycle (see Figure  
 148 1). As presented in Figure 2, the retort unit is equipped with pneumatic

149 valves, used to control temperature and pressure along the sterilization cycle  
150 by regulating steam, air input and bleeder streams.

151 Two motorized valves, one to set up cooling water flow and the other  
152 dedicated to drain water from the vessel (either condensate or cooling wa-  
153 ter) complete the set of actuators. Pressure and temperature in the retort  
154 are measured by a number of ST18 piezo-resistive and PT100 temperature  
155 transmitters, indicated as  $P$  and  $T$  in Figure 2. These devices are installed  
156 both along the steam supply line (from boiler to steam valve) and in the  
157 retort. A set of thermocouples (Ecklund type T) (indicated as  $TC$  in the  
158 figure) is also employed to measure temperature at different locations within  
159 the product. As represented in the figure, signals are processed by ADAM  
160 modules and recorded in the monitoring and control computer.

161 The monitorization and control interface has been developed in Labview<sup>1</sup>,  
162 a flexible acquisition and control software environment to record tempera-  
163 ture, pressure and valve position on the one hand, and to implement control  
164 actions on the other. In the present study, data sampling and actuations  
165 were carried out at intervals of 5 seconds. The environment accepts the  
166 integration of modular and Matlab compatible process simulators such as  
167 EcosimPro<sup>2</sup>, with optimization software. This allows on-line prediction of  
168 the evolution of safety and quality parameters such as lethality or nutrient  
169 retention, for instance. A diagram showing the information flow between the  
170 process and the different elements that constitute the control system is pre-  
171 sented in Figure 3. The input-output data transfer, monitoring and control,  
172 simulation and optimization units constitute the building blocks of the real  
173 time optimal controller. Its elements and interconnections will be explained  
174 in more detail in Section 2.3.

## 175 2.2. Mathematical description of the process

176 Any model based control architecture requires a reliable dynamic repre-  
177 sentation of the plant. In our case the plant comprises two interrelated  
178 models: one to describe temperature and pressure evolution in the retort  
179 unit and the other to describe the evolution of safety and quality product  
180 properties during the thermal treatment. In the case of solid foodstuffs, these  
181 properties are in one way or another related to the temporal and spatial

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.ni.com/labview/>

<sup>2</sup><http://www.ecosimpro.com/>






Figure 3: The software-hardware architecture. Information on the present status of the process is collected by the data acquisition module and sent to the plant simulator as initial conditions to predict future scenarios. The optimization module will interact with the simulator to compute the optimal policies. The resulting optimal profile will be sent back to the data acquisition as set-points.

distribution of temperature within the product, what calls for mathematical models described by partial differential equations (Balsa-Canto et al., 2002a).

The model employed to describe the evolution of retort temperature and pressure along the complete sterilization cycle is taken from Alonso et al. (1997). In order to make this work as self-contained as possible, a brief outline of the model, including its underlying mass and energy balances, is presented in Appendix A. Because in practice the system operates under well mixed conditions, the variables of interest are described by a set of ordinary differential equations, which formally can be expressed as:

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = f(\mathbf{x}; \theta) + g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}; \theta), \quad (1)$$

where  $f(\mathbf{x}; \theta)$  and  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}; \theta)$  are nonlinear vector fields of appropriate dimensions.  $\mathbf{x}$  denotes the state vector with elements being the retort temperature and pressure,  $T_R$  and  $P_R$ , respectively. The input vector  $\mathbf{u}$  collects the relevant control variables, namely valve positions for the steam and air input streams as well as output streams such as drain and bleeder. Finally,  $\theta$  denotes the vector of critical parameters associated to the process which, in our case, corresponds with the convective heat transfer coefficient of the vessel



198  $h_c$ , and steam and bleeder valve constants  $(C_{vs}, \alpha_s)$  and  $(C_{vb}, \alpha_b)$ . Further  
 199 information on valve parameters as well as the explicit relations underlying  
 200 the formal representation (1), can be found in Appendix A.

201 The solid product to be sterilized is assumed to be packed in cylindrical  
 202 RO-100 containers. In this way, temperature distribution in the product will  
 203 be modeled by the so-called Fourier equation for heat conduction:

$$\frac{\partial T_{prod}}{\partial t} = \alpha \left[ \frac{\partial^2 T_{prod}}{\partial z^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial T_{prod}}{\partial r} \right) \right], \quad (2)$$

204 where  $r$  and  $z$  are the cylindrical coordinates representing radius and length  
 205 of the container, respectively (see Figure 4 for a representation of the spatial  
 206 domain).  $T_{prod}(r, z, t)$  stands for product temperature, and  $\alpha$  for product  
 thermal diffusivity.




Figure 4: Section of a cylindrical can. By symmetry, Fourier equation needs to be solved only on a quadrant with coordinates taking values:  $0 \leq r \leq R$  and  $0 \leq z \leq L/2$ , where  $R$  and  $L$  are the total cylinder radius and length, respectively. For RO-100 containers,  $R = 0.0326$  m and  $L = 0.03$  m.

207

208 The equation is completed with (Robin-type) boundary conditions of the  
 209 form:

$$k \left( \frac{\partial T_{prod}}{\partial z} \right)_{z=\pm L} = h (T_R(t) - T_{prod}(r, \pm L, t)), \quad (3)$$

$$k \left( \frac{\partial T_{prod}}{\partial r} \right)_{r=R} = h (T_R(t) - T_{prod}(R, z, t)), \quad (4)$$

$$\left( \frac{\partial T_{prod}}{\partial r} \right)_{r=0} = 0, \quad (5)$$

210 where  $k$  is the thermal conductivity and  $h$  represents the convective heat  
 211 transfer coefficient between the product and the retort environment (satu-  
 212 rated steam). These equations are combined with temperature dependent  
 213 kinetics to account for the evolution of safety and quality parameters within  
 214 the product. In testing the on-line optimizing control configuration, and fol-  
 215 lowing the works by Balsa-Canto et al. (2002a,b), lethality at the coldest  
 216 point  $F_0(t)$ , and nutrient retention at the surface ( $C_i^s$ ) will be considered as  
 217 the representative safety and quality parameters. Their time evolution at  
 218 each location within the product will be modeled by the following ordinary  
 219 differential equations:

$$\frac{dC_i^s}{dt} = - \left( \frac{\ln 10}{D_{i,ref}} \right) C_i^s \exp \left( \frac{T_s - T_{i,ref}}{Z_{i,ref}} \right), \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{dF_0}{dt} = 10^{\frac{T_c(t) - T_{M,ref}}{Z_{M,ref}}}, \quad (7)$$

220 where  $T_c$  corresponds with temperature at the coldest point and  $T_s$  surface  
 221 temperature. Parameters  $(Z_{M,ref}, T_{M,ref})$  and  $(Z_{i,ref}, D_{i,ref}, T_{i,ref})$  represent  
 222 the kinetic coefficients for the target pathogen (subscript  $M$ ) and the quality  
 223 factor (subscript  $i$ ). In our case and since we are interested in low-acid  
 224 canned foods, the target pathogen parameters used to calculate commercial  
 225 sterility will correspond with those of *C. sporogenes*<sup>3</sup>. On the other hand,  
 226 thiamine retention will be the quality factor considered in this work. The list  
 227 of physical and kinetic parameters used in this work is presented in Table 1.

228 Typical methods to numerically solve Eqns (2)-(5) make use of a cer-  
 229 tain spatial discretization scheme such as finite elements to approximate the  
 230 original distributed system by a large set of ordinary differential equations,  
 231 which is often computationally involved. This obstacle is particularly appar-  
 232 ent when using the model in the context of a dynamic optimization prob-  
 233 lem where multiple simulations are needed for objective function evaluation  
 234 (Balsa-Canto et al., 2002b). In order to overcome such limitation, reduced  
 235 order dynamic representations with particular emphasis on the POD (Proper  
 236 Orthogonal Decomposition) method have been employed in this work to cap-  
 237 ture the slow -thus representative- dynamics for temperature and quality.

---

<sup>3</sup>As it is well established in thermal processing, this is a microorganism very similar to *C. botulinum* but with a higher heat resistance. Thus, its destruction ensures that of *C. botulinum* spores.

Table 1: The set of physical and kinetic parameter values employed in the model.

Parameter	Value	Units
$\alpha$	$1.11 \times 10^{-7}$	$m^2 \cdot s^{-1}$
$h$	$10^4$	$W \cdot m^{-2} \cdot K^{-1}$
$k$	0.53	$W \cdot m^{-1} \cdot K^{-1}$
$D_{i,ref}$	10716	$s$
$z_{i,ref}$	25.5	$^{\circ}C$
$T_{i,ref}$	121.11	$^{\circ}C$
$z_{M,ref}$	10	$^{\circ}C$
$T_{M,ref}$	121.11	$^{\circ}C$

238 Details on this particular method are presented in Appendix B (for the in-  
239 terested reader, see also Sirovich (1987); Balsa-Canto et al. (2002a); Garcia  
240 et al. (2007)).

### 241 2.3. The optimal control configuration

242 The control framework we propose in this work is presented in Figure  
243 5 on block diagram form. It essentially consists of two interrelated layers:  
244 a regulatory feed-back control loop built around a set of robust tracking  
245 controllers, and a supervisory structure which is where optimal decisions are  
246 produced, based on the current state of the process (i.e current process and  
247 product temperatures, pressure, lethality, and product quality). This layer  
248 contains model calibration and predictive tools which make use of a virtual  
249 representation of the plant (the modelling/simulation block), combined with  
250 dynamic optimizers to explore future operation scenarios, which satisfying  
251 safety constraints, will ensure optimal final product quality. In what follows  
252 the different layers of the proposed control configuration will be discussed in  
253 detail.

#### 254 Model identification and calibration

255 Identification and optimal experimental design methods are used to estimate  
256 the physical model parameters in Eqns (1) or (2) from the available mea-  
257 surements (Balsa-Canto et al., 2010; Balsa-Canto & Banga, 2011). To that  
258 mission the process identification block of Figure 5 is devised, in a way to  
259 ensure that the uncertainty between the plant and the model is minimized  
260 or at least maintained under reasonable bounds during the operation.

261 Model identification is an activity which usually needs to be carried out




Figure 5: The block diagram depicts the complete control structure configuration for on-line optimal decision making in thermal processing, including the regulatory and supervisory control layers. The regulatory layer is composed of a robust controller (in our case a PI controller) that provides temperature and pressure set-point tracking. At the supervisory level, plant information is employed to calibrate the dynamic models of the plant (process identification) and to compute in the optimization block, optimal temperature and pressure set-point profiles to be sent to the regulatory controllers.  $T_R$  and  $P_R$  stand for retort temperature and pressure and  $T_p$  for product temperature.  $u_s$ ,  $u_a$  and  $u_w$  represent steam, air and water valve positions.

off-line. Model calibration however can be performed either on-line, during the process operation, or on a batch-to-batch basis, depending on the nature of the model or the estimation method selected. In this work, optimal experimental design and parameter estimation have been carried out on a batch-to-batch basis. Parameters to be estimated include valve related parameters (steam and bleeder valves as described in Appendix A and Table A.6) and convective heat transfer coefficient in the retort.

All computations have been performed using AMIGO (Advanced Model Identification using Global Optimization), a multi-platform toolbox developed by Balsa-Canto & Banga (2011) which covers all the steps of the iterative identification procedure: local and global sensitivity analysis, multi-experiment parameter estimation, identifiability analysis and optimal experimental design. It also incorporates several state of the art simulators and local, global and hybrid nonlinear programming solvers.

### The regulatory layer

Regulatory controllers with proportional and integral action (PI) are employed to track retort temperature and pressure set-points. During the heating stage, temperature is controlled by acting on the steam valve for fixed

280 values of drain and bleeder (see Figure 2). On the other hand, a pressure  
 281 PI controller acting on air is employed to end-up the heating stage and to  
 282 initiate cooling by maintaining the retort under overpressure, and in this way  
 283 to compensate for sudden pressure drops which could result into cracks or  
 284 unsealing of containers.

285 Controllers have been designed under the Internal Model Control (IMC)  
 286 paradigm (Ogunnaike & Ray, 1994) assuming a first order open loop system's  
 287 response in terms of temperature or pressure to steps in steam or air valve  
 288 positions, respectively. The following structure has been proposed for both  
 289 controllers:

$$u(t) = \frac{\tau_p}{\lambda k_p} e(t) + \frac{1}{\lambda k_p} \int_0^t e(\xi) d\xi, \quad (8)$$

290 where  $e(t) = y^{sp} - y$  is the error between the set-points  $y^{sp}$  and the current  
 291 measurements  $y$  (representing either  $T_R$  or  $P_R$ ).  $k_p$  and  $\tau_p$  are the gain and  
 292 time constant associated to the input-output response, and  $\lambda$  is the first  
 293 order low-pass filter constant selected to tune the closed-loop response speed  
 294 (Alonso et al., 1998). Equation (8) can be accommodated into the standard  
 295 PI form, with  $K$  and  $\tau_I$  being the controller gain and integral time constant,  
 296 by means of the following equivalences:

$$K \equiv \frac{\tau_p}{\lambda k_p} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{K}{\tau_I} \equiv \frac{1}{\lambda k_p}. \quad (9)$$

297 In its final form, temperature and pressure controllers have been tuned so  
 298 that  $K = 0.1$  and  $\tau_I = 20s$ . Typical open and closed loop retort responses in  
 299 terms of temperature and pressure to set-points  $T_R^{sp}$  and  $P_R^{sp}$  are presented  
 300 in Figures 6 and 7.

### 301 **Computing and implementing optimal control policies**

302 The dynamic optimization block, depicted in Figure 5 is the component re-  
 303 sponsible for taking optimal decisions at any time during the sterilization  
 304 cycle, based on the present measurements and the estimated states of the  
 305 process. To that purpose, this module is closely linked to the process simu-  
 306 lator, which in fact takes the place of a virtual plant where future operation  
 307 policies can be quickly examined in order to select the optimal one. The op-  
 308 timal control problems to solve will differ in the functional to be maximized  
 309 or minimized. Nonetheless a safety constraint on the minimum acceptable  
 310 lethality  $F_0^*$  to be attained should be present in all formulations. Typical  
 311 objectives may include the minimization of process time  $t_f$  or the maximiza-




Figure 6: Evolution of retort temperature under PI control to a train of steps in the set point temperature. The corresponding open loop retort temperature evolution predicted by simulation is also represented for comparison purposes. Parameters for the PI controller (9) were  $K = 0.1$ ,  $\tau_I = 20s$ .

tion of a given quality factor (a nutrient retention for instance) compatible with a minimum acceptable lethality at a given final time  $t_f^*$ .

As it has been discussed in the introduction, such problems have been considered for long in the literature. However, most of them, if not all, reduced to finding an off-line optimal retort temperature profile without any consideration of the retort dynamics or unexpected disturbances that may render the computed profile suboptimal. As we will show in the next section, disregarding the dynamics of the retort and regulatory layer in the statement of the optimal control problem may lead more often than not to unfeasible retort temperature profiles, or to operations that are too energy demanding.

The optimal control problem we state next will explicitly consider the dynamics of the retort (1) and regulatory configuration (8), in addition to heat transfer in the product (2)-(5) and the dynamics for quality and lethality, modeled by Eqns (6) and (7). Subject to the above mentioned dynamic constraints, a typical optimal control problem can be formally stated as follows:

**Optimal Quality Control.** Find the retort temperature set-point profile  $T_R^{sp}(t)$  along a sterilization cycle  $0 \leq t \leq t_f^*$ , which maximizes final nutrient retention  $C_i^s(t_f^*)$  subject to a minimum acceptable lethality at the coldest point within the product i.e.  $F_0(t_f^*) \geq F_0^*$ , a retort temperature within a lower and




Figure 7: Pressure control tracking at the early cooling stage (pressure response is represented by the dashed line). Cooling water enters the retort producing a disturbance which is efficiently compensated by the controller. Parameters for the PI controller (9) were  $K = 0.1$ ,  $\tau_I = 20s$ .

331 upper bounds  $\underline{T}_R \leq T_R(t) \leq \bar{T}_R$  and a final temperature at the coldest point  
 332  $T_c(t_f^*) \leq T_c^*$ . Note that when dealing with real time optimization, it may  
 333 result convenient to include  $t_f^*$  (final sterilization time) as a decision variable  
 334 since it will add flexibility to the optimization problem, particularly at the  
 335 last steps of the sterilization cycle.

336 In this work we will concentrate on the optimal quality control problem  
 337 with the following specifications:  $\underline{T}_R = 102^\circ C$  and  $\bar{T}_R = 125^\circ C$ . Maximum  
 338 acceptable final temperature at the coldest point being  $T_c^* = 80^\circ C$  and final  
 339 lethality  $F_0^* = 8min^4$ . When  $t_f$  is included as a decision variable in the  
 340 optimization problem, lower and upper bounds become  $\underline{t}_f^* = 55$  and  $\bar{t}_f^* = 80$   
 341 minutes, respectively.

342 Numerically, the original optimal control problems are formulated as non-  
 343 linear programming problems (NLP) which approximate the original ones via  
 344 the control vector parameterization (CVP) method. The resulting NLPs may  
 345 then be solved with a global optimization solver -(see Banga et al., 2003) for  
 346 details-. In this work a hybrid stochastic-deterministic method based on the

---

<sup>4</sup>This value corresponds with the commercial lethality for low acid prepackaged foods.



scatter search approach has been employed. Details of the algorithm SSm (Scatter Search in matlab) can be seen in Egea et al. (2007). It is worth noting that since the dynamics of the retort is explicitly considered, the resulting retort temperature path is by construction feasible. Moreover, in order to ensure robustness, the computed policy will be sent to the regulatory layer, generally as a VRT (variable retort temperature) set-point. In the event of unexpected disturbances such as those in the steam supply, for instance, the optimal control problems can be recomputed and the new profiles implemented. This will prevent the over-processing of the product and in turn will save energy, ensure safety and maximize quality.

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. Model identification

The model of the plant to be identified is that describing temperature and pressure evolution in the retort, which we formally represent by Eqn (1) and is described in Appendix A. These equations provide the boundary conditions associated to the model that predicts evolution of temperature, nutrient retention and lethality inside the food product (Eqns. (2)-(7)).

In this study, the goal of model identification was twofold: on the one hand to identify the functional dependency of steam and bleeder flows with respect to the control variables, namely valve openings. On the other hand, to identify unknown critical model parameters. The behavior of valves is usually represented by empirical relations obtained from experiments. In this work, the expressions employed are presented in Appendix A, Table A.6. Critical model parameters correspond to the convective heat transfer coefficient  $h_c$  as well as valve characteristic parameters  $C_{vs}$ ,  $C_{vb}$ ,  $\alpha_s$  and  $\alpha_b$ .

The characteristic valve parameters  $C_{vj}$  are functions of the percentage of valve opening giving rise to linear, equal percentage or quick flow opening (Smith & Corripio, 1997). The different possibilities have been collected into a battery of models which are presented in Appendix A. A model identification protocol has then been established to cover the following steps (Balsa-Canto et al., 2010):

- Structural identifiability<sup>5</sup> analysis of all model candidates.

---

<sup>5</sup>A model is said to be structurally identifiable if parameters may be given unique values under ideal, noise free and continuous, experimental data.

- Distinguishability<sup>6</sup> analysis of all model candidates.
- Parameter estimation from experimental data. Experiments were performed in the pilot plant under different constant and time varying steam and bleeder valves opening profiles.
- Model discrimination and improvement of its predictive capabilities by means of model based optimal experimental design.

The values obtained for the critical parameters are presented in Table 2. The performance of the resulting model is illustrated in Figure 8 where real and predicted temperature evolution in response to changes in the steam valve position are compared. As it can be seen in the figure there is a fair




Figure 8: Experimental and predicted evolution of retort temperature in response to a train of steps in the steam valve. Bleeder opening is at 20%, and drain opening at 55%.

agreement between experimental data and model with a maximum error of  $2.80^{\circ}\text{C}$  corresponding to the prediction of temperature in the fast transition from  $115^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $123^{\circ}\text{C}$ .

---

<sup>6</sup>Two (or several) models are distinguishable if for given control values the outputs from the different models are also different.

Table 2: The resulting values for the critical parameters obtained after the iterative identification procedure.

$h_c$ ( $J/sKm^2$ )	$C_{vs}$	$C_{vb}$	$\alpha_s$	$\alpha_b$
11.983	5.2088	6.8834	1	1

### 3.2. Dynamic optimization

In order to evaluate the effect of retort dynamics on the solution of the optimal quality control problem stated in Section 2.3, two optimal retort temperature set-point profiles ( $T_R^{sp}(t)$ ) have been computed: one of them, we will refer to as *OP1*, considers only the dynamics of heat transfer within the product, defined by Eqn (2) with its associated boundary conditions. The other (*OP2*), in addition to equation (2) takes into account the dynamics of the retort described by Eqn (1).

The proper orthogonal decomposition method described in Appendix B has been used to produce fast simulations of the product dynamics. For the case under study five basis functions, what amounts to solving 5 ODEs (ordinary differential equations), were enough to provide a satisfactory accuracy. Note that in contrast, a classical method such as the finite element method results into a system with more than 300 ODEs, i.e., with around 60 times more equations than with the POD method.

Following the CVP paradigm, the optimal profiles  $T_R^{sp}(t)$  are found within the set of step-wise continuous functions. For illustrative purposes, profiles consisting of 4 steps with 12.5 minutes length each, were considered to compare *OP1* and *OP2* cases<sup>7</sup>. Results for *OP1* and *OP2* in terms of final retention, lethality and final temperature at the center of the product are presented in Table 3. As it can be seen from the results, both solutions respect constraints on final lethality ( $F_0^* = 8$  minutes) and maximum allowed temperature at the center of the product ( $T_c^* = 80^\circ\text{C}$ ) with a very similar value of the objective function. However, the implementation in pilot plant of the temperature profile corresponding to *OP1* leads to a final lethality  $F_0 = 7.53$  minutes, clearly below the constraint. This shows that disregarding

<sup>7</sup>In this case the final sterilization time  $t_f^*$  is not included as a decision variable since the objective of this experiment is to show the impact of disregarding the retort dynamics on the safety parameter.

Table 3: Comparison of results for *OP1* (without retort dynamics) and *OP2* (with retort dynamics). Computed values correspond with the solution of the optimal control problem while experimental values are those obtained after implementation in pilot plant.

	<i>OP1</i>		<i>OP2</i>	
	Computed	Experimental	Computed	Experimental
Retention (%)	67.07	67.63	67.14	66.97
Lethality (min)	8.00	7.53	8.00	8.01
$T_c$ (°C)	79.97	79.51	79.98	79.76

ing the dynamics of the process (the retort) may lead to unfeasible solutions, i.e. solutions that do not verify the safety constraint (in our case  $F_0 \geq 8$  minutes).

The optimal profile associated to *OP2* is depicted in Figure 9 together with the experimental evolution of retort temperature, and the temperature at the center of the product (both predicted and experimental). The evolution of the retention and lethality obtained by the set-point profiles corresponding to *OP1* and *OP2* are presented in Figure 10.

Note that unfeasible solutions in *OP1* could be avoided by explicitly constraining the retort temperature profile. Unfortunately it is not trivial to link constraints in the profile, for example maximum temperature rate change, with the actual manipulated variables (valve position, for instance). In addition such relationships might depend on the actual operation due to the intrinsic nonlinearity of the process unit. Safe values can be defined but they are likely to result into an unnecessary slow process with detrimental effects in quality or operation parameters (e.g. slower processes will lead to longer process times). In summary, unfeasible solutions can be avoided by constraining the temperature profile but that will lead in most cases to suboptimal operation. A precise characterization of limits on the achievable profiles must rely either on extensive experiments on the plant (energy and time consuming) or on the use of a detailed model of the plant. This second approach is the one we propose, although not to be implemented on a trial and error basis, but by letting the optimizer to implicitly find the feasible limits on the temperature profiles that optimize the selected criteria.




Figure 9: Implementation of the optimal retort temperature profile computed by considering the dynamics of the product and the process. Cooling stage starts at the dashed vertical line around 55 minutes. From that time on, temperature set-point coincides with cooling water temperature.

### 3.3. Real time optimization

In the event of process disturbances that might cause deviations from the prescribed safety or quality constraints, the optimal quality control problem must be recomputed based on the present available information of the system. This has been done by means of a real time optimization scheme, implemented as follows:

1. Given the current state of the process (i.e. retort and product temperature as well as actual product lethality and retention) an optimal control problem is solved.
2. The resulting optimal retort temperature profile is implemented in the form of set-points on the regulatory layer
3. Periodically, predictions are compared with the real state of the plant to check for possible deviations.
4. If any significant deviation occurs a new optimal profile is recomputed and implemented (steps 1 and 2).

In order to solve for the first time the optimal control problem, a careful analysis of the effect of varying the number of steps in the control vector




Figure 10: Evolution of retention and lethality corresponding to the implementation of the optimal quality control profiles considering the dynamics of the product (OP1) and the dynamics of the product and the process (OP2).

parameterization approach was performed. To do so the optimization problem was solved by means of SSm global optimizer (Egea et al., 2007), using an increasing number of steps. The results, presented in Table 4 show that the use of variable retort profiles (VRT) offer a substantial improvement in nutrient retention with respect to the widely used constant retort profiles (CRT), as already shown by Teixeira et al. (1975), Banga et al. (1991) or Durand (1997). In addition, the results suggest that 8 control steps seem to be enough since larger discretization levels do not lead to relevant improvements in the maximum retention. It should be noted that the corresponding number of decision variables and the associated computational cost are also reasonable for the purpose of real time optimization. In this case, the final sterilization time  $t_f$  is included as a decision variable in order to add flexibility to the optimization problem.

The CPU time shown in the table could be considered as a reference of the maximum CPU time required for on-line optimization, because global optimizers will only be used in the case of large perturbations. In addition it should be noted that typical on-line optimization (with local methods) takes no more than a few seconds and the computational cost decreases as the process evolves since the number of control elements is being reduced accordingly.

Table 4: Comparison in terms of maximum retention reached, between different control discretization schemes. A CRT (constant retort temperature) profile corresponds with one step. Number of control steps larger than 8 did not result into significant improvements on the objective function.

Number of steps	Optimal retention (%)	CPU Time (s)
1	63.461	17
2	66.654	28
4	67.166	53
6	67.585	175
8	67.771	219
10	67.774	376

In the case of small perturbations, a local direct search optimization solver is used. Note that the optimal solution will be close to the original thus a local optimizer offers a good compromise between convergence rate and computational cost. In the event of larger perturbations, it may happen that feasibility of the solution may not be guaranteed or that the new optimum is far from the previous one. In these scenarios a global optimization method SSm (Egea et al., 2007) is used to prevent convergence to suboptimal solutions. Note, in addition, that the processing time may increase depending on the magnitude and location of the perturbation.

The recomputed optimal profiles are implemented in the plant as soon as they become available and that depends on the time for the optimizer to obtain a solution. As discussed above, the CPU times in our case ranged from seconds to a few minutes.

In order to test the performance of the proposed real-time optimal control strategy, a sudden pressure drop in the steam supply was induced during the process. Such scenario is typical of industrial plants where many retorts are simultaneously operating what results into extremely large steam demands which may cause retort pressure and temperature to fall down. This situation is illustrated in Figure 11 where the process is being affected by a pressure drop that starts at 37.7 minutes and lasts for 50 seconds.

Figure 12 represents both the optimal temperature set-point profile computed off-line and the one recomputed on-line. The corresponding evolution of retention and lethality are depicted in Figure 13. Its final values together with temperature at the center of the product are summarized in Table 5.






Figure 11: On-line implementation of the optimal retort temperature profile in the event of disturbances. Disturbance (a pressure drop that last for 50 seconds) occurs at 37.7 minutes. A new optimal temperature set point profile is recomputed to keep specifications.

Table 5: Results of real time optimization in the presence of disturbances.

	Off line implementation	On-line implementation
Retention (%)	68.5	67.0
Lethality (min)	7.21	8.47
$T_c$ (°C)	80.0	80.0

As illustrated by the figures, on-line re-optimization during the sterilization cycle guarantees safety specifications while minimizing over-processing. In fact, the optimization scheme corrects the pressure drop by increasing the set point temperatures in the remaining steps compensating the sharp drop of temperature due to the pressure failure.

#### 4. Conclusions

This work presents the development and validation of a real-time optimization architecture to operate thermal sterilization of packaged foods in batch retorts so as to maximize nutrient retention while satisfying safety




Figure 12: A comparison of the optimal temperature set-points computed off-line and on-line in the event of disturbances. The temperature set-point profile has been discretized in 8 elements of 7 minutes length each.

513 related constraints under retort temperature deviations due to unexpected  
 514 process disturbances.

515 The proposed architecture consists of two interrelated layers: a regu-  
 516 latory feed-back loop built around the robust tracking controller, and the  
 517 supervisory structure which is where optimal decisions are taken based on  
 518 the current state of the process. This supervisory structure relies on the syn-  
 519 chronous combination of reliable and computationally efficient models of the  
 520 process and food product with a efficient and robust optimization structure.  
 521 In this regard, first principle based models were identified and validated to de-  
 522 scribe temperature and pressure within the retort and temperature, lethality  
 523 and nutrient retention within the food product. Computationally efficient  
 524 versions of these models were derived by means of model reduction tech-  
 525 niques based on POD expansion. Finally, advanced dynamic optimization  
 526 techniques, that make use of global hybrid optimization methods, were used  
 527 to compute off-line and on-line optimal operation conditions.

528 As a proof of concept the methodology has been applied to the steriliza-  
 529 tion of solid foodstuffs. However the methodology by no means restricts to  
 530 homogeneous products. Inhomogeneous solids as well as other geometries or  
 531 packages can be accommodated into the same paradigm. In terms of mo-  
 532 deling, the finite element method is general enough to handle a variety of




Figure 13: Evolution of retention and lethality corresponding to the implementation of the on-line and off-line optimal temperature profiles.

geometries or diverse non-homogeneous transfer mechanisms including natural convection, for instance. Of course, higher complexity would increase the computational burden which in turns could jeopardize the real time specification. Nonetheless, as it has been discussed previously, methods such as PODs or spectral decomposition provide accurate low dimensional approximations that can be successfully employed in real time applications.

The performance of the proposed RTO architecture was validated experimentally on a pilot plant located at IIM-CSIC, testing it under process perturbations and showing how it is possible to optimally command the system to attain quality specifications while satisfying safety related constraints.

## Acknowledgements

This work has been funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (SMART-QC, AGL2008-05267-C03-01), Xunta de Galicia (IDECOP, 08DPI007402PR) and FP7 CAFE project (KBBE-2007-1-212754). Ana I Arias Méndez acknowledges financial support from the CSIC JAE-predoc programme.

## 549 References

- 550 Abakarov, A., Sushkov, Y., Almonacid, S., & Simpson, R. (2009). Multiob-  
551 jective optimization approach: thermal food processing. *Journal of Food*  
552 *Science*, *74*, E471–E487.
- 553 Akterian, A. (1999). On-line control strategy for compensating for arbitrary  
554 deviations in heating medium temperature during batch thermal steriliza-  
555 tion processes. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *39*, 1–7.
- 556 Alonso, A. A., Banga, J. R., & Perez-Martin, R. I. (1997). A complete  
557 dynamic model for the thermal processing of bioproducts in batch units  
558 and its application to controller design. *Chemical Engineering Science*, *52*,  
559 1307–1322.
- 560 Alonso, A. A., Banga, J. R., & Perez-Martin, R. I. (1998). Modelling and  
561 adaptive control of a batch sterilization process. *Computers & Chemical*  
562 *Engineering*, *22*, 445–458.
- 563 Ansorena, M. R., & Salvadori, V. O. (2011). Optimization of thermal pro-  
564 cessing of canned mussels. *Food Science and Technology International*, *17*,  
565 449–458.
- 566 Balsa-Canto, E., Alonso, A. A., & Banga, J. R. (2002a). A novel, efficient  
567 and reliable method for thermal process design and optimization. Part I:  
568 theory. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *52*, 227–234.
- 569 Balsa-Canto, E., Alonso, A. A., & Banga, J. R. (2010). An iterative identi-  
570 fication procedure for dynamic modelling of biochemical networks. *BMC*  
571 *Systems Biology*, *4*, 1–18.
- 572 Balsa-Canto, E., & Banga, J. R. (2011). Amigo, a toolbox for advanced model  
573 identification in systems biology using global optimization. *Bioinformatics*,  
574 *27*, 2311–2313.
- 575 Balsa-Canto, E., Banga, J. R., & Alonso, A. A. (2002b). A novel, efficient  
576 and reliable method for thermal process design and optimization. Part II:  
577 applications. *Journal of Food Engineering*, *52*, 235–247.
- 578 Banga, J. R., Balsa-Canto, E., & Alonso, A. A. (2008). Quality and safety  
579 models and optimization as part of computer-integrated manufacturing.  
580 *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, *7*, 168–174.

- 581 Banga, J. R., Balsa-Canto, E., Moles, C. G., & Alonso, A. A. (2003). Im-  
582 proving food processing using modern optimization methods. *Trends in*  
583 *Food Science and Technology*, 14, 131–144.
- 584 Banga, J. R., Perez-Martin, R. I., Gallardo, J. M., & Casares, J. J. (1991).  
585 Optimization of thermal processing of conduction-heated canned foods,  
586 study of several objective functions. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 14,  
587 25–51.
- 588 Camacho, E., & Bordóns, C. (1995). *Model predictive control in the process*  
589 *industry*. London: Springer-Verlag.
- 590 Chalabi, Z. S., van Willigenburg, L. G., & van Straten, G. (1999). Robust  
591 optimal receding horizon control of the thermal sterilization of canned  
592 foods. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 40, 207–218.
- 593 Chen, C. R., & Ramaswamy, H. S. (2002). Modeling and optimization of  
594 variable retort temperature (VRT) thermal processing using coupled neural  
595 networks and genetic algorithms. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 53, 209–  
596 220.
- 597 Chen, G., Campanella, O. H., Corvalan, C. M., & Haley, T. A. (2008). On-  
598 line correction of process temperature deviations in continuous retorts.  
599 *Journal of Food Engineering*, 84, 258–269.
- 600 Durance, T. D. (1997). Improving canned food quality with variable retort  
601 temperature processes. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 8, 113–118.
- 602 Egea, J. A., Rodriguez-Fernandez, M., Banga, J. R., & Marti, R. (2007).  
603 Scatter search for chemical and bioprocess optimization. *Global Optimiza-*  
604 *tion*, 37, 481–503.
- 605 Enitan, A. M., & Adeyemo, J. (2011). Food processing optimization using  
606 evolutionary algorithms. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 10, 16120–  
607 16127.
- 608 Erdogdu, F., & Balaban, M. O. (2003). Complex method for nonlinear con-  
609 strained multi-criteria (multi-objective function) optimization of thermal  
610 processing. *Journal of Food Process Engineering*, 26, 357–375.

- 611 Flores-Cerrillo, J., & MacGregor, J. F. (2005). Latent variable mpc for  
612 trajectory tracking in batch processes. *Journal of Process Control*, 15,  
613 651–663.
- 614 Garcia, M. R., Vilas, C., Banga, J. R., & Alonso, A. A. (2007). Optimal field  
615 reconstruction of distributed process systems from partial measurements.  
616 *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research*, 46, 530–539.
- 617 Koribilli, N., Aravanudan, K., & Varadhan, M. U. S. V. A. (2011). Quantify-  
618 ing enhancement in heat transfer due to natural convection during canned  
619 food thermal sterilization in a still retort. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*,  
620 4, 429–450.
- 621 Kurtanek, Z. (2008). Opportunities and challenges of model predictive  
622 control in food technologies. In *Proceeding of the 4th Central European*  
623 *Congress of Food, Biotechnologists and Nutritionists. Vol 1.* (pp. 105–110).
- 624 Lopez, A. (1987). *A complete course in canning*. Baltimore, 12th Ed: Can-  
625 ning Trade Inc.
- 626 Martins, R. C., Lopes, V. V., Vicente, A. A., & Teixeira, J. A. (2008). Com-  
627 putational shelf-life dating, complex systems approaches to food quality  
628 and safety. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, 1, 207–222.
- 629 Miri, T., Tsoukalas, A., Bakalis, S., Pistikopoulos, E. N., Rustem, B., &  
630 Fryer, P. J. (2008). Global optimization of process conditions in batch  
631 thermal sterilization of food. *Food and Bioprocess Technology*, 87, 485–  
632 494.
- 633 Nadkarni, M. M., & Hatton, T. A. (1985). Optimal nutrient retention during  
634 the thermal processing of conduction-heated canned foods, applications of  
635 the distributed minimum principle. *Journal of Food Science*, 50, 1312–  
636 1321.
- 637 Ogunnaike, B. A., & Ray, W. H. (1994). *Process dynamics, modelling and*  
638 *control*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 639 Ravindran, S. S. (2000). A reduced-order approach for optimal control of  
640 fluids using proper orthogonal decomposition. *International Journal for*  
641 *Numerical Methods in Fluids*, 34, 425–448.

- 642 Saguy, I., & Karel, M. (1979). Optimal retort temperature profile in op-  
 643 timizing thiamine retention in conduction-type heating of canned foods.  
 644 *Journal of Food Science*, 44, 11485–11490.
- 645 Sendin, J. O. H., Alonso, A. A., & Banga, J. R. (2010). Efficient and robust  
 646 multi-objective optimization of food processing: A novel approach with  
 647 application to thermal sterilization. *Journal of Food Engineering*, 98, 317–  
 648 324.
- 649 Simpson, R., & Abakarov, A. (2011). Optimization of food thermal process-  
 650 ing: Sterilization stage and plant production scheduling. In *Food Engi-  
 651 neering Interfaces* Food Engineering Series (pp. 261–284). Springer New,  
 652 York.
- 653 Simpson, R., Abakarov, A., & Teixeira, A. (2008). Variable retort tempera-  
 654 ture optimization using adaptive random search techniques. *Food Control*,  
 655 19, 1023–1032.
- 656 Simpson, R., Almonacid, S., & Mitchell, M. (2004). Mathematical model de-  
 657 velopment, experimental validation and process optimization, retortable  
 658 pouches packed with seafood in cone frustum shape. *Journal of Food En-  
 659 gineering*, 63, 153–162.
- 660 Simpson, R., Figueroa, I., & Teixeira, A. (2007a). Simple, practical and  
 661 efficient on-line correction of process deviations in batch retort through  
 662 simulation. *Food Control*, 18, 458–465.
- 663 Simpson, R., Teixeira, A., & Almonacid, S. (2007b). Advances with intelli-  
 664 gent on-line retort control and automation in thermal processing of canned  
 665 foods. *Food Control*, 18, 821–833.
- 666 Sirovich, L. (1987). Turbulence and the dynamics of coherent structures. Part  
 667 I: coherent structures. *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, 45, 561–571.
- 668 Smith, C. A., & Corripio, A. B. (1997). *Principles and practice of automatic  
 669 process control*. New York, 2nd Ed: Wiley.
- 670 Teixeira, A. A., & Tucker, G. S. (1997). On-line retort control in thermal  
 671 sterilization of canned foods. *Food Control*, 8, 13–20.



Teixeira, A. A., Zinsmeister, G. E., & Zahradnik, J. W. (1975). Computer simulation of variable retort control and container geometry as possible means of improving thiamine retention in thermally processed foods. *Journal of Food Science*, 40, 656–659.

## Appendix A. Mathematical Model of the Thermal Processing Unit

A complete mathematical description of thermal processing in batch retorts that includes all stages of the sterilization cycle can be found in Alonso et al. (1997). The model is based on mass and energy balances for liquid water, steam and air on the retort under well mixed conditions and the ideal gas assumption. For the sake of completeness, a summary of the main equations and constitutive relations employed to describe heat and mass flows is presented next.

Using the subscripts  $s$ ,  $w$  and  $a$ , to denote steam, water and air, respectively, mass balances in the retort take the form:

$$\frac{dm_s}{dt} = F_s^i - x_s F_b + \gamma, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\frac{dm_w}{dt} = F_w^i - F_d - \gamma, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\frac{dm_a}{dt} = F_a^i - x_a F_b, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where  $F$  represents flows, superscript  $i$  input streams, and  $x_s$ ,  $x_a$ , are the mass fractions of steam and air in the bleeder stream. The expressions that describe flows through steam and bleeder valves during the heating stage as a function of the states (temperature, pressure), steam pressure supply ( $P_{supply}$ ) and valve positions have been taken from Smith & Corripio (1997) and are presented in Table A.6.

The term  $\gamma$  in the right hand side of (A.1) or (A.2) represents the vapor flow transferred from the liquid phase to the vapor phase within the retort. This term was first introduced in Alonso et al. (1997) to describe scenarios in which both liquid and vapor phases coexist as it is the case during the early stages of cooling or under incomplete drainage during heating. At every instant,  $\gamma$  must be such that it balances the mass of steam accumulated in the available volume with that in equilibrium at the retort temperature. Thus it can be computed as the value which makes zero the following equation:

$$\Psi(\gamma) = m_s(\gamma) - \frac{P^{eq}(T_R)V_s(\gamma)M_w}{RT_R}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

700 where  $P^{eq}$  is the vapor pressure of water related to the retort temperature  
 701 by Antoine's law<sup>8</sup>.  $M_w$  denotes molecular weight of water (in  $kg/mol$ ) and  
 702  $R$  the universal constant of gases ( $R = 8.314 J/molK$ ). Finally,  $V_s$  in (A.4)  
 703 represents the volume available to the vapor phase, which is obtained as the  
 704 difference between that of the retort  $V_R$  and the one occupied by the liquid  
 705 water phase (density  $\rho_w$ ), e.g.

$$V_s = V_R - \frac{m_w(\gamma)}{\rho_w}. \quad (A.5)$$

706 It must be noted that during the heating stage all the condensate formed is  
 707 drained, thus  $\gamma = 0$  what simplifies the mass balances.

708 Under the same assumptions, the balance for internal energy  $U$  in the  
 709 retort is of the form:

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = \sum_j F_j^i \mathcal{H}_j^i - F_b(\mathcal{H}_s^b x_s + \mathcal{H}_a^b x_a) - F_d \mathcal{H}_w^d - Q_{tot}, \quad (A.6)$$

710 where:

$$U = \sum_j m_j \mathcal{U}_j. \quad (A.7)$$

711  $\mathcal{U}_j$  represents internal energy per unit of mass, and the summations in (A.6)  
 712 and (A.7) extend to all components/phases (i.e.  $s$ ,  $w$  and  $a$ ) in their respec-  
 713 tive input streams or in the retort.  $\mathcal{H}_s^b$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_w^d$  and  $\mathcal{H}_a^b$  denote enthalpy per unit  
 714 of mass for saturated steam, water and air at the conditions of the bleeder  
 715 and drain streams, as indicated by the superscript. Finally, the term  $Q_{tot}$   
 716 represents the heat transfer rate associated to all relevant heat sinks. These  
 717 include the heat absorbed by the retort itself ( $Q_{ret}$ ), the product  $Q_{prod}$ , and  
 718 the heat released to the environment by radiation and convection ( $Q_{rad}$  and  
 719  $Q_{conv}$ ), so that:

$$Q_{tot} = Q_{ret} + Q_{prod} + Q_{rad} + Q_{conv}. \quad (A.8)$$

720 The expressions employed for the different heat transfer rates are presented  
 721 in Table A.7. During the heating stage, model (A.1)-(A.6) simplifies since  
 722 only saturated steam is present in the retort. In this case  $U$  (relation (A.7))

---

<sup>8</sup>As it can be found in any standard textbook on process thermodynamics, the expres-  
 sion reads  $P^{eq} = \exp\left(A + \frac{B}{T-C}\right)$ , with  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  being parameters dependent on the  
 particular chemical species, water in this case.

Table A.6: Expressions for flow through valves as described in Smith & Corripio (1997) with characteristic valve parameter  $C_f = 0.9$  and  $\alpha_j$  identifying the type of valve nonlinearity. Valve opening  $u_j$  accepts values between 0 and 1.  $P_{supply}$  defines the pressure at which steam is supplied to the unit and  $P_{atm}$  is atmospheric pressure.

---


$$F_s^i = 3.4 \cdot 10^{-8} \delta_s(u_s) C_f P_{red} \sqrt{G_f(w_s - 0.148w_s^3)}$$

$$F_b = 3.4 \cdot 10^{-8} \delta_b(u_b) C_f P^{eq} \sqrt{G_f(w_b - 0.148w_b^3)}$$

$$w_s = \frac{1.63}{C_f} \sqrt{\frac{P_{supply} - P_R}{P_{supply}}}$$

$$w_b = \frac{1.63}{C_f} \sqrt{\frac{P_R - P_{atm}}{P_R}}$$

$$\delta_j(u_j) = C_{vj} u_j^{1/\alpha_j} \text{ with } j \text{ being either steam (s) or bleeder (b) valves.}$$


---

Table A.7: Heat transfer rates associated to the main sinks.  $m_{prod}$  and  $C_{p_{prod}}$  are the total mass and heat capacity of the product.  $m_{ret}$ ,  $A_{ret}$  and  $C_{p_{ret}}$  are the total retort mass, area and heat capacity, respectively.  $\varepsilon = 0.99$  is the emissivity of the object, and  $\sigma = 5.6710^{-8} W/m^2 K^4$  is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant.

---


$$Q_{ret} = m_{ret} C_{p_{ret}} \frac{dT_R}{dt}$$

$$Q_{prod} = m_{prod} C_{p_{prod}} \int_V \dot{T}_{prod} d\xi$$

$$Q_{rad} = \varepsilon \sigma A_{ret} (T_R^4 - T_{ext}^4)$$

$$Q_{conv} = h_c A_{ret} (T_R - T_{ext})$$


---

723 reduces to  $U = m_s(T_R)\mathcal{U}_s(T_R)$ . Computing its time derivative, substituting  
 724 Eqns (A.1) and (A.6) into the resulting expression and reordering terms, we  
 725 end up with the following nonlinear differential equation:

$$\beta \frac{dT_R}{dt} = F_s - F_b - \frac{Q_{rad} + Q_{conv}}{\lambda}, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

726 with  $\beta$  of the form:

$$\beta = \left[ \frac{m_{ret}C_{pret}}{\lambda} - \left( \frac{BT}{(T-C)^2} + 1 \right) \frac{V_s P^{eq}}{RT_R^2} \right], \quad (\text{A.10})$$

727 which describes the evolution of the retort temperature as a function of steam  
 728 and bleeder flows.

## 729 **Appendix B. The proper orthogonal decomposition**

730 Classical numerical methods for solving partial differential equations of  
 731 the form (2) may result unsuitable for real time tasks like optimization. In  
 732 this section we present an efficient order reduction technique known as the  
 733 *proper orthogonal decomposition* (POD) (Sirovich, 1987) to overcome this  
 734 limitation. For the sake of clarity, let us re-write Eqn (2) as follows:

$$\frac{\partial T_{prod}}{\partial t} = \alpha \mathcal{A} T_{prod}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

735 where  $\mathcal{A}$  represents the laplacian operator in cylindrical coordinates

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} + \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \right).$$

736 In the POD technique, as in many other numerical methods employed for  
 737 solving PDEs, the solution  $T_{prod}$  is approximated by a  $N$ -terms truncated  
 738 Fourier series of the form:

$$T_{prod}(\xi, t) \approx \sum_{i=1}^N m_i(t) \phi_i(\xi), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

739 where  $\xi$  represents the spatial coordinates  $z$  and  $r$ . Basis functions in the set  
 740  $\{\phi_i(\xi)\}_{i=1}^N$  are orthogonal and contain the spatial dependency of the solution,  
 741 while the set  $\{m_i(t)\}_{i=1}^N$  collects the time dependent coefficients.

Each element  $\phi_i(\xi)$  is computed off-line as the solution of the following integral eigenvalue problem (Sirovich, 1987; Ravindran, 2000):

$$\int_{\mathbb{V}} R(\xi, \xi') \phi_i(\xi') d\xi' = \lambda_i \phi_i(\xi), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where  $\lambda_i$  corresponds with the eigenvalue associated with each global eigenfunction  $\phi_i$ . The kernel  $R(\xi, \xi')$  in equation (B.3) corresponds with the two point spatial correlation function, defined as follows:

$$R(\xi, \xi') = \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \hat{T}_{prod}(\xi, t_j) \hat{T}_{prod}(\xi', t_j), \quad (\text{B.4})$$

with  $\hat{T}_{prod}(\xi, t_j)$  denoting the value of the field at each instant  $t_j$ . The values of  $\hat{T}_{prod}(\xi, t_j)$  can be obtained experimentally or by direct numerical simulation of Eqn (B.1), and the summation extends over a sufficiently rich collection of uncorrelated snapshots at  $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ .

The number of elements ( $N$ ) in the approximation (B.2) is usually chosen using a criteria based on the so-called *energy* captured by the POD basis. Such term is related to the eigenspectrum  $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$  through the following expression:

$$E(\%) = 100 \times \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \lambda_i} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

The time dependent coefficients  $\{m_i(t)\}_{i=1}^N$  in Eqn (B.2), are computed by projecting the original PDE system (B.1) into each element of the POD basis set. Formally this is done as follows:

$$\int_{\mathbb{V}} \phi_i \frac{\partial T_{prod}}{\partial t} d\xi = \int_{\mathbb{V}} \phi_i (\alpha \mathcal{A} T_{prod}) d\xi; \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Substituting the Fourier series approximation (B.2) into Eqn (B.6) leads to:

$$\int_{\mathbb{V}} \phi_i \sum_{j=1}^N \phi_j \frac{dm_j}{dt} d\xi = \alpha \sum_{j=1}^N m_j \int_{\mathbb{V}} \phi_i (\mathcal{A}) \phi_j d\xi. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

759 The basis functions obtained from (B.3) are orthogonal and can be normali-  
 760 zed so that:

$$\int_{\mathbb{V}} \phi_i \phi_j d\xi = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases} .$$

761 Eqn (B.7) is then rewritten as:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{m}}{dt} = \alpha \mathbf{A} \mathbf{m}, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

762 where  $\mathbf{A}$  is the matrix resulting from the projection of the laplacian operator  
 763  $\mathbf{A} = \int_{\mathbb{V}} \Phi^T \mathcal{A} \Phi d\xi$  with  $\Phi = [\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_N]^T$  and  $\mathbf{m}$  corresponds with the  
 764 following column vector  $\mathbf{m} = [m_1, m_2, \dots, m_N]^T$ .

765 At this point both the basis functions and the time dependent coefficients  
 766 are known and the field can be recovered by means of Eqn (B.2). Note that  
 767 the accuracy of the approximation can be improved arbitrarily by increasing  
 768 the number of elements  $N$  in the basis set  $\Phi$ .